

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 12-17 and 19-26 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3-6, 12-17 and 19-26 are rejected. Claims 1, 12, 13, 16, 20, 23, and 24 have been amended. Claims 3, 25, and 26 have been cancelled. New claims 27-40 have been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Interview Summary

On November 10, 2008, Representative for Applicant and Examiner Burd discussed the 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit that was filed with the Request for Continued Examination dated August 5, 2008. Examiner Burd stated that, upon consulting with his Supervisor, the 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit is considered effective to antedate U.S. Publication No. 2004/0086054 to Corral ("Corral"). Therefore, Representative for Applicant and Examiner Burd agree that Corral is ineffective as prior art against the Present Application.

II. Rejection of Claims 12, 13, 20, and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 12, 13, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by "*OFDM with Reduced Peak-to-Average Power Ratio by Multiple Signal Representation*", vol. 52, no. 1/2, 2/1997, XP 000991143, by Muller, et al. ("Muller"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12 has been amended to specifically define the definition of "replica" with respect to the plurality of replica signals. Specifically, each of the replica signals is provided in claim 12 as being substantial replicas of the input signal scaled in amplitude and having a sum that is approximately equal to the input signal. The specific definition of "replica signals" now provided in claim 12 is thus both consistent with plain meaning and the definition that is provided in the Specification of the Present Application (see, e.g., Present Application, paragraph 27).

In the Office Action dated August 22, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action"), the Examiner again maintains that Muller discloses a plurality of replica signals, each of the plurality of replica signals having a maximum peak value below the maximum peak value of the input signal, as recited in claim 12 (Office Action, page 4; citing Muller, FIG. 5; page 63). Representative for Applicant again respectfully disagrees. Muller discloses that each of V pairwise disjointed sub-blocks are divided in such a way that every used subcarrier within the OFDM symbol is represented in exactly one of the V sub-blocks (Muller, Section V.1). FIG. 4 of Muller demonstrates three sub-blocks, with only one of the sub-blocks including a given portion of the signal at any given time (Muller, FIG. 4; Section V.1). As evident from FIG. 4, the three sub-blocks are in no way identical or even similar to each other, such that they could be considered replicas with respect to each other or to the original signal. At no point does Muller disclose or imply that the sub-blocks are or could be identical based on the disclosure in Muller that every used subcarrier within the OFDM symbol is represented in *exactly one* of the V sub-blocks (Muller, Section V.1; emphasis added). If the sub-blocks were indeed replicas with respect to each other and the original signal, such as to be replicas of the input signal scaled in amplitude, as recited in claim 12, then every used subcarrier within the OFDM symbol would be represented in all of the V sub-blocks. Therefore, Muller fails to teach that a plurality of replica signals that each have a maximum peak value below the maximum peak value of the input signal, as recited in claim 12.

The Examiner cites U.S. Patent No. 6,294,956 to Ghanadan, et al. ("Ghanadan") as providing information regarding the term replica, as the Examiner concedes that Muller does not disclose what constitutes a replica signal, (Office Action, page 4). Ghanadan teaches that a splitter can provide replicas of a signal to two orthogonal filters (Ghanadan, col. 14, ll. 39-41; FIG. 17). In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "[t]he context of 'replica' is consistent with Muller's signal shown in FIG. 5," and thus appears to equate "replica" signals with the splitting of a signal into separate parts that are pair-wise disjointed, as disclosed in Muller. The Examiner states that the orthogonal "filters of Ghanadan shape the frequency content of the different versions of the signal to improve the power efficiency of the transformed signals

compared to the power efficiency of the original signal," (Office Action, page 5; citing Ghanadan, col. 14, ll. 39-45). Such a statement is completely irrelevant the elements of claim 12 and thus provides no basis for how the context of the term "replica" in Ghanadan is consistent with the signals demonstrated in FIG. 5 of Muller, as asserted by the Examiner (Office Action, page 5). As described above and as conceded by the Examiner, Muller fails to disclose that the split signals are replicas. To interpret the separate, pair-wise disjointed signal blocks as disclosed by Muller is contrary to the plain meaning definition of the term "replica", the disclosed teachings of Ghanadan, and the language of amended claim 12.

The Examiner supports the assertion that Muller discloses replica signals by stating that "the signals of Muller are consistent with the replica signals of Ghanadan where the signals have portions of the signals removed via the filters," and that "the signals will each contain a replica of a portion of the original signal for processing," (Office Action, page 2). Once again, the Examiner describes the system of Ghanadan without demonstrating relevance to the system of Muller in how the separate signals demonstrated in FIG. 4 of Muller can be considered replica signals, despite those separate signals of Muller neither resembling each other nor the original signal. The "replica signals" of Ghanadan are only replica signals upon being split from the original signal. After being filtered by the orthogonal filter, the signals of Ghanadan are no longer referred to as "replica signals" by Ghanadan, but are instead "different versions of the original signal $S(t)$," (Ghanadan, col. 14, 41-45). Therefore, even assuming *arguendo* that the signals of Ghanadan can be considered replica signals upon being split versions of the original signal $S(t)$, they are no longer replica signals upon being filtered and processed, just like the sub-blocks of Muller are not replica signals upon being separately and independently crest-reduced by the rotation vectors, as demonstrated in FIG. 4 of Muller.

Representative for Applicant further respectfully submits that Muller does not teach a signal combiner that sequentially orders the plurality of replica signals for transmission, as recited in claim 12. In the rejection of claim 12, the Examiner asserts that Muller discloses "a method and apparatus for splitting an input signal into a plurality of replica signals," and that the "signals are combined in the adder of figure 5," (Office Action, page 4). The Examiner also

asserts that "Muller discloses sequentially ordering the replica signals shown in figure 4 and combining the signals in the adder of figure 5 to recreate the original signals with crest factor reduction," (Office Action, page 2). Representative for Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As described above, FIG. 4 of Muller demonstrates three sub-blocks, with only one of the sub-blocks including a given portion of the signal at any given time (Muller, FIG. 4; Section V.1). FIG. 4 therefore merely demonstrates three separate examples of sub-blocks of the signal, and in no way demonstrates a sequential ordering of the sub-blocks. In addition, Muller discloses that the partial transmit sequences that each have the applied rotation vectors are provided to an adder which adds them together to produce the composite peak-reduced signal \tilde{a}_p (Muller, FIG. 5). FIG. 5 of Muller is therefore an OFDM transmitter for transmitting the resultant signal (Muller, page, 63, first column, last paragraph). Thus, Muller teaches that each of the partial transmit sequences are combined together as a sum of the sub-blocks, and not as a sequential order of the sub-blocks (see Muller, FIG. 5; Equation 20).

For all of these reasons, Muller does not teach each and every element of claim 12. Accordingly, Muller does not anticipate claim 12. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12, as well as claim 13 which depends therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12, which is not anticipated by Muller for the reasons described above. Therefore, claim 13 should likewise be allowed over the cited art. In addition, claim 13 recites that the instruction signal informs a receiver of at least one of the number of replica signals and scaling associated with the replica signals. Muller teaches that side information of a set of rotation factors is transmitted to the receiver (Muller, Section V.2). However, because Muller does not teach that peaks are reduced based on the scaling of the replica signals, or that the replica signals are sequentially ordered for transmission, Muller likewise does not teach that the instruction signal informs a receiver of at least one of the number of replica signals and scaling associated with the replica signals, as recited in claim 13. Therefore, Muller does not anticipate claim 13. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been amended substantially similar to claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 recites modifying an input signal into a plurality of replica signals, each of the plurality of replica signals being substantial replicas of the input signal scaled in amplitude and having a sum that is approximately equal to the input signal, such that each of the plurality of replica signals has a peak value below the maximum peak value of the input signal, and sequentially ordering the plurality of replica signals into a transmission signal. For the reasons described above regarding claim 12, Muller does not anticipate claim 20. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20, as well as claim 21 which depends therefrom, is respectfully requested.

For the reasons described above, claims 12, 13, 20 and 21 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 14, 15, 17, 19, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 14, 15, 17, 19, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0086054 to Corral ("Corral"). As described above in the Interview Summary, Corral is not prior art with respect to the Present Application. This rejection is therefore considered moot.

IV. Rejection of Claims 14, 15, 17, 19, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 14, 15, 17, 19, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,146 to Tellado, et al. ("Tellado"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claim 14, the Examiner asserts that "the transmitter of Tellado inserts side information prior to transmission of the signal," and that the "side information and the data are transmitted in a 'parallel relationship,'" (Office Action, page 7). However, in making these assertions, the Examiner provides no citation to or support from Tellado. Tellado discloses that side information corresponding to a peak-reduced signal can be sent on a per symbol basis or less frequently (Tellado, col. 27, ll. 13-16). Tellado is silent as to the manner of how the side information is sent from the transmitter or received at the receiver. Therefore, Tellado fails to

teach that side information is *inserted* prior to transmission of a signal, as asserted by the Examiner, because there is no teaching in Tellado that the side information is incorporated into the peak reduced signal. Likewise, Tellado fails to teach that the side information and the data are transmitted in a parallel relationship, as asserted by the Examiner, because Tellado fails to provide any detail as to how the side information is sent to the receiver other than on a per symbol basis. In other words, there is no indication from the disclosure of Tellado that the side information is transmitted concurrently with the peak reduced signal. Therefore, Tellado fails to teach means for transmitting a transmission signal that includes the modified input signal and the instruction signal transmitted in a parallel relationship, such that the instruction signal is transmitted concurrently with the modified input signal, as recited in claim 14. Accordingly, Tellado fails to anticipate claim 14. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14, as well as claims 15 and 16 that depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 15, as described above, Tellado fails to teach that side information is inserted prior to transmission of a signal, as asserted by the Examiner, because there is no teaching in Tellado that the side information is incorporated into the peak reduced signal. Therefore, Tellado fails to teach means for combining the modified input signal and the instruction signal into the transmission signal, as recited in claim 15. Accordingly, Tellado fails to anticipate claim 15. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 17, the Examiner rejects claim 17 for the same reasons as claim 14. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that "the transmitter of Tellado inserts side information prior to transmission of the signal," and that the "side information and the data are transmitted in a 'parallel relationship,'" (Office Action, pages 7-8). However, claim 17 recites combining the modified input signal and the instruction signal into a transmission signal in a *sequential* relationship, such that the instruction signal is transmitted *prior to the modified input signal* (emphasis added). Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 17 is deficient as the Examiner is not appreciative of the language of claim 17. As described above regarding claim 14, Tellado fails to disclose how the side information is transmitted to the receiver. Therefore, Representative for Applicant also respectfully submits that Tellado does not teach combining the

modified input signal and the instruction signal into a transmission signal in a sequential relationship, such that the instruction signal is transmitted prior to the modified input signal, as recited in claim 17. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17, as well as claim 19 which depends therefrom, is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 19, as described above, Tellado fails to teach that side information is inserted prior to transmission of a signal, as asserted by the Examiner, because there is no teaching in Tellado that the side information is incorporated into the peak reduced signal. Therefore, Tellado fails to teach that the side information and the peak reduced signal are combined, and thus fails to teach separating the modified input signal from the instruction signal and reconstructing the modified input signal to its original form prior to peak reduction based on information associated with the instruction signal or code, as recited in claim 19. Accordingly, Tellado fails to anticipate claim 19. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 22, the Examiner rejects claim 17 for the similar reasons as claim 14. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that "the transmitter of Tellado inserts side information prior to transmission of the signal," and that "the side information corresponding to a peak-reduced signal can be sent on a per symbol basis or less frequently," (Office Action, pages 8; citing Tellado, col. 27, ll. 13-16). However, Representative for Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claim 22 is not appreciative of the language of claim 22. Specifically, claim 22 recites that the modification information *resides* at the second communication device prior to the receiver receiving the transmitted modified input signal (emphasis added). Thus, assuming *arguendo* that Tellado can be considered to disclose that the transmitter inserts side information prior to transmission of the signal, the side information would not reside at the receiver prior to the receiver receiving the transmitted modified input signal. Regardless, as described above, Tellado discloses that side information corresponding to a peak-reduced signal can be sent on a per symbol basis or less frequently (Tellado, col. 27, ll. 13-16). There is thus no indication that the side information resides at the receiver prior to the receiver receiving the peak reduced signal. Therefore, Tellado fails to teach that the

modification information resides at the second communication device prior to the receiver receiving the transmitted modified input signal, as recited in claim 22. Accordingly, Tellado fails to anticipate claim 22. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22, as well as claim 23 that depends therefrom, is respectfully requested.

For the reasons described above, claims 14, 15, 17, 19, and 22 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corral in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0099302 to Tong, et al. ("Tong"). As described above in the Interview Summary, Corral is not prior art with respect to the Present Application. This rejection is therefore considered moot.

VI. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tellado in view of Tong. Claims 3, 25 and 26 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the instruction signal is transmitted in a parallel relationship with the peak reduced input signal, such that the instruction signal and the peak reduced signal are transmitted from the communication device concurrently and are received at the receiver concurrently. As described above regarding claim 14, the Examiner asserts that "the transmitter of Tellado inserts side information prior to transmission of the signal," and that the "side information and the data are transmitted in a 'parallel relationship,'" (Office Action, page 7). However, in making these assertions, the Examiner provides no citation to or support from Tellado. Tellado discloses that side information corresponding to a peak-reduced signal can be sent on a per symbol basis or less frequently (Tellado, col. 27, ll. 13-16). Tellado is silent as to the manner of how the side information is sent from the transmitter or received at the receiver. Therefore, Tellado fails to teach or suggest that the instruction signal is transmitted in a

parallel relationship with the peak reduced input signal, such that the instruction signal and the peak reduced signal are transmitted from the communication device concurrently and are received at the receiver concurrently, as recited in claim 1. The addition of Tong does not cure the deficiencies of Tellado to teach or suggest this element of claim 1. Accordingly, neither Tellado nor Tong, individually or in combination, teach or suggest claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, as well as claims 4-6 and 24 which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 4, the Examiner rejects claim 4 by stating that "Tellado discloses the transmission of side information and the peak reduced signal," (Office Action, page 11; citing Tellado, col. 27, ll. 6-27). However, as described above, Tellado fails to disclose the manner in which the side information is sent from the transmitter or received at the receiver. Thus, Tellado fails to teach or suggest that the instruction signal is an instruction code that is modulated into the peak reduced input signal, as recited in claim 4. Therefore, neither Tellado nor Tong, individually or in combination, teach or suggest claim 4. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corral in view of Muller. As described above in the Interview Summary, Corral is not prior art with respect to the Present Application. This rejection is therefore considered moot.

VIII. Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tellado in view of Muller. Claim 16 depends from claim 14. As described above, Tellado fails to teach means for transmitting a transmission signal that includes the modified input signal and the instruction signal transmitted in a parallel relationship, such that the instruction signal is transmitted concurrently with the modified input signal, as recited in claim 14, and thus does not teach or suggest claim 14. The addition of Muller does not cure the deficiencies of Tellado to

teach or suggest claim 14, from which claim 16 depends. Therefore, neither Tellado nor Muller teach or suggest claim 16.

In addition, claim 16 has been amended to recite that the replica signals are each substantial replicas of the input signal scaled in amplitude and having a sum that is approximately equal to the input signal. As described above regarding claim 12, Muller does not teach or suggest replica signals that are substantial replicas of the input signal scaled in amplitude and having a sum that is approximately equal to the input signal, as recited in claims 12 and 16. Therefore, neither Tellado nor Muller, individually or in combination, teach or suggest claim 16. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

IX. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corral in view of WO 01/43320 A2 to Kupferschmidt, et al. ("Kupferschmidt"). As described above in the Interview Summary, Corral is not prior art with respect to the Present Application. This rejection is therefore considered moot.

X. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tellado in view of Kupferschmidt. Claim 23 has been amended to recite that the modification information comprises an amplitude scale factor associated with reducing peak values. In contrast, Kupferschmidt discloses a scale factor that is a reference frequency value that is implemented for error correction (see Kupferschmidt, Abstract; Summary). Therefore, Kupferschmidt does not disclose that the modification information comprises an amplitude scale factor associated with reducing peak values, as recited in amended claim 23. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

XI. Rejection of Claims 24-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corral in view of Tong, and further in view of Kupferschmidt. As described above in the Interview Summary, Corral is not prior art with respect to the Present Application. This rejection is therefore considered moot.

XII. Rejection of Claims 24-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tellado in view of Tong, and further in view of Kupferschmidt. Claims 25 and 26 have been cancelled. Claim 24 has been amended to recite that the modifications of the input signal comprise scaling an amplitude of the input signal to reduce the peak values associated with the input signal. In contrast, Kupferschmidt discloses a scale factor that is a reference frequency value that is implemented for error correction (see Kupferschmidt, Abstract; Summary). Therefore, Kupferschmidt does not disclose that the modifications of the input signal comprise scaling an amplitude of the input signal to reduce the peak values associated with the input signal, as recited in amended claim 24. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

XIII. New claims 27-40

New claim 27 depends from claim 1 and recites that the instruction signal is configured as an orthogonal code that is combined with the peak reduced input signal prior to transmission from the communication device. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 27. Consideration and allowance of new claim 27 is respectfully requested.

New claim 28 depends from claim 1 and recites that the instruction signal occupies a first frequency band and the peak reduced input signal occupies at least one additional frequency band upon concurrent transmission from the communication device. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 28. Consideration and allowance of new claim 28 is respectfully requested.

New claim 29 depends from claim 4 and recites that the instruction signal and the peak reduced input signal are modulated in a time-division multiple access (TDMA) manner prior to transmission. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 29. Consideration and allowance of new claim 29 is respectfully requested.

New claim 30 depends from claim 12 and recites that a known instruction code associated with reconstructing the input signal to its original form prior to modification resides at a receiver that receives the plurality of replica signals, such that the receiver is configured to reconstruct the input signal to its original form prior to modification based on the known instruction code. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 30. Consideration and allowance of new claim 30 is respectfully requested.

New claim 31 depends from claim 13 and recites that the instruction signal is configured as an orthogonal code that is combined with the sequentially ordered plurality of replica signals prior to transmission from the communication device. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 31. Consideration and allowance of new claim 31 is respectfully requested.

New claim 32 depends from claim 13 and recites that the sequentially ordered plurality of replica signals occupies a first frequency band and the instruction signal occupies at least one additional frequency band, the instruction signal and the sequentially ordered plurality of replica signals being transmitted substantially concurrently from the communication device. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 32. Consideration and allowance of new claim 32 is respectfully requested.

New claim 33 depends from claim 13 and recites that the instruction signal and the sequentially ordered plurality of replica signals are modulated in a time-division multiple access (TDMA) manner prior to transmission. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 33. Consideration and allowance of new claim 33 is respectfully requested.

New claim 34 depends from claim 15 and recites that the means for combining comprises means for modulating the instruction signal as an orthogonal code into the modified input signal prior to transmission from the communication device. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 34. Consideration and allowance of new claim 34 is respectfully requested.

New claim 35 depends from claim 14 and recites that the means for transmitting is configured to transmit the modified input signal at a first frequency band and to transmit the instruction signal at at least one additional frequency band substantially concurrently from the communication device. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 35. Consideration and allowance of new claim 35 is respectfully requested.

New claim 36 depends from claim 15 and recites that the means for combining comprises means for modulating the instruction signal into the modified input signal in a time-division multiple access (TDMA) manner prior to transmission. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 36. Consideration and allowance of new claim 36 is respectfully requested.

New claim 37 depends from claim 21 and recites modulating an instruction signal as an orthogonal code into the transmission signal prior to transmission, the instruction signal being employed by a receiver to reconstruct the input signal in its original form prior to modification. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 37. Consideration and allowance of new claim 37 is respectfully requested.

New claim 38 depends from claim 21 and recites transmitting the transmission signal at a first frequency band and transmitting an instruction signal at at least one additional frequency band substantially concurrently, the instruction signal being employed by a receiver to reconstruct the input signal in its original form prior to modification. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 38. Consideration and allowance of new claim 38 is respectfully requested.

New claim 39 depends from claim 21 and recites modulating an instruction signal into the transmission signal in a time-division multiple access (TDMA) manner prior to transmission, the instruction signal being employed by a receiver to reconstruct the input signal in its original form prior to modification. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 39. Consideration and allowance of new claim 39 is respectfully requested.

New claim 40 depends from claim 21 and recites reconstructing the plurality of replica signals into the input signal comprises reconstructing the plurality of replica signals into the

input signal in its original form prior to modification based on a known instruction code associated with reconstructing the input signal to its original form that resides at a receiver that receives the plurality of replica signals. None of the cited art teaches or suggests new claim 40. Consideration and allowance of new claim 40 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 20 November 2008

/Christopher P Harris/

Christopher P. Harris
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER NO.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072